

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM: William F. Donnelly
Deputy Director for Administration
7D24, Headquarters

EXTENSION

NO.

DDA 86-1308/1

DATE

1 August 1986

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.

C/IMS/DO
1D4124, Hdqs.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Ken:

If the underlined statement in this memorandum is true, it's a sad situation to find in 1986. We ought to talk about this--not wait until September.

William F. Donnelly

ORIG: O/DDA:WFDonnelly:bop

Distribution:

0 - Adse
1 - DDA Subj
1 - DDA Chrono
1 - WFD Chrono

DD/A REGISTRY

FILE: 100-7

77A
7c-1308

77

21 July 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR: Edward J. Maloney

FROM: [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: Deja-Vu DO and SAFE

We just had a meeting with IMS to discuss the status of the SAFE versus MVS only solutions to the ALLSTAR Upgrade. They already have the IBM MVS only proposal. [REDACTED] (who has done a great job on this effort) will have the SAFE proposal ready the end of July for review by other OIT organizations and be ready to present it to IMS by the second week in August. IMS is planning on having an offsite on Sept 10-11 to select their option which they will support. IISG will be in attendance along with other evaluators.

The problem is that at the meeting it very quickly became evident that IMS has already made their choice for primarily non-technical reasons. [REDACTED] was making comments such as the functions are the same, the cost is the same and the hardware configurations are similar. The real issue came out when I forced a discussion on control of the software. The problem has not changed over the last year since IMSs last offsite; they want to own the software and feel like they have 100 per cent control over it. IMS is not willing to accept the concept that they will have a reasonable control over the software in a shared environment with DI and will be able to effect changes as they are needed. I do not see IMS trying to work this issue between now and the off-site. I do see it being the hidden agenda that makes the selection obvious. They will claim all other factors are basically a wash.

IMS has even stated there is no way to define evaluation criteria they can use for the selection process. The question is what to do now. We have requested [REDACTED] to meet with [REDACTED] to discuss the control issue. I guess IISG will have to wait until after the offsite evaluation to take action. I am not sure how IMS will evaluate the less risk and common development advantages of the SAFE approach.

I bring this to your attention to let you know the current status and the high probability that there will be major discord over the

selection. IMS [redacted] will be presenting his recommendation to [redacted] around the end of September.

STAT
STAT

Distribution:

[redacted]

STAT

- addressee

[redacted]

STAT